

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/806,940	FINNIE, RICHARD B.
	Examiner Niki M. Eloshtay	Art Unit 3781

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Niki M. Eloshtay. (3) Mr. Richard Finnie.
 (2) Mr. Hamill (Reg. No. 37,145). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: 3 sizes of claimed invention.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed amendment to claims 1, 8, 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Beale and Zoss, applied in rejection.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Finnie discussed the commercial success of the claimed invention. Mr. Hayill discussed that Beale requires a rim, as disclosed in [0036], [0039] and [0041]. The proposed claims include a limitation regarding the sidewall being rimless.

The examiner stated that she will update her search but the proposed amendments appear to define the invention over Beale and Zoss.